Appeal: 15-7874 Doc: 9 Filed: 04/25/2016 Pg: 1 of 3

## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-7874

FLOYD DINSDALE BOLDING,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS; EARL BARKSDALE, Warden,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. James R. Spencer, Senior District Judge. (3:15-cv-00290-JRS-RCY)

Submitted: April 15, 2016 Decided: April 25, 2016

Before KING, WYNN, and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Floyd Dinsdale Bolding, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Appeal: 15-7874 Doc: 9 Filed: 04/25/2016 Pg: 2 of 3

## PER CURIAM:

Floyd Dinsdale Bolding seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying as successive his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition. order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A) (2012). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2012). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the petition states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. Slack, 529 U.S. at 484-85.

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Bolding has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis, and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately

Appeal: 15-7874 Doc: 9 Filed: 04/25/2016 Pg: 3 of 3

presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED